

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

**ABDELNASER J. AL-HASAN,
Plaintiff,**

v.

Case No. 14-C-0611

**MILWAUKEE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING,
Defendant.**

ORDER

On October 31, 2013, I issued an order addressing the defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiff Abdnaser Al-Hasan's complaint for employment discrimination. In that order, I dismissed one of plaintiff's claims without prejudice for failure to allege that the EEOC had issued a right-to-sue letter. Plaintiff has since filed a motion for leave to amend his complaint to allege that, in fact, the EEOC has issued such a letter. The defendant opposes the motion to amend on the ground that the allegations relating to the claim at issue—a claim involving what I have previously referred to as the "2011 decision"—fail to state a plausible claim for relief, and that therefore the amendment would be futile.¹ However, the claim is plausible. To state a plausible claim for employment discrimination, a plaintiff need only allege the type of discrimination he thinks occurred, by whom, and when. Swanson v. Citibank, N.A., 614 F.3d 400, 405 (7th Cir. 2010). Here, plaintiff has alleged all of these things. He has alleged that he was discriminated against on the basis of national origin, race, religion, and color; that the discrimination was committed by the

¹The plaintiff originally filed the amended complaint without seeking leave to do so, and the defendant moved to strike the amended complaint on that ground. Subsequently, the plaintiff filed a motion to amend.

Chair of the Mathematics Department; and that it occurred in 2011. Therefore, the amendment is not futile.

For the reasons stated, **IT IS ORDERED** that the defendant's motion to strike is **DENIED** and plaintiff's motion to amend is **GRANTED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 5th day of March, 2014.

s/ Lynn Adelman

LYNN ADELMAN
District Judge